DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 097 UD 018 239

AUTHOR Noblit, George W.; Collins, Thomas W.
TITLE Goals, Race and Roles: Staff and Student Patterns in the Desegregation Process.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 78
CONTRACT 400-76-0031
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (Toronto, Canada, March, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Classroom Integration; Conflict; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Public Education; *School Integration; *School Segregation; Senior High Schools; *Social Stratification; Social Values
IDENTIFIERS Tennessee (Memphis)

ABSTRACT

In this paper the compatibility of education and school desegregation are examined. The history of mass education in the United States is described as one of conflict over the meaning of integration. Desegregation is said to constitute a challenge to the assimilative logic of public education, charging the schools with accountability for integrating those who have not been assimilated. As such, forced integration is seen as challenging the major social control mechanism of public schooling. In order to demonstrate the incompatibility between desegregation and public education, an investigation was conducted in a desegregated Memphis high school. Using ethnographic data on the administrative, academic and student subsystems in the school, it is shown that student stratification and resegregation persisted in the newly integrated school. This phenomenon and the types of problems emerging from the desegregation process are offered as proof that goals of desegregation may be incompatible with the goals of the American public educational system as they are now defined. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154097

Goals, Race and Roles: Staff and Student Patterns in the Desegregation Process

by

George W. Noblit
Department of Sociology

Thomas W. Collins
Department of Anthropology

Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

The research upon which this paper is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-009 with the Field Studies in Urban Desegregated Schools Program of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency. This paper was presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meetings, Toronto, Canada, March 1978.

Printed in U.S.A.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD018239

ABSTRACT

It seems inevitable that desegregation cannot be embraced as a goal for public school since it violates the historical purpose and function of the institution to discriminate between and control young people. This paper presents ethnographic data on a Southern high school which was desegregated. These data show that the desegregated goal led to specialized roles on the part of staff and students to achieve desegregation or education.

Goals, Race and Roles: Staff and Student Patterns in the Desegregation Process.

It used to be that the controversy over the public schooling was a simple dichotomy. There were those who thought public schools were essentially alright but needed some technical changes and increased support, and there were those who thought public schools were based upon the wrong logic and needed basic restructuring. That era has past. School desegregation has complicated all that. Those who were pro-public schools are now more fatalistic and those who were anti-public schools now find themselves supporting public schools because without that desegregation might give way to resegregation.

This confusion persists, some would posit, because the incompatability of desegregation and education goals. Some are pro-desegregation essentially because it challenges the logic of public schools, and some are anti-desegregation for the same reason. Those who lean to the left usually embrace the former, and this intriguingly represents a "liberal" attitude concerning social change. Those who lean to the right usually embrace the latter, and this represents a "conservative" attitude. As such then, school desegregation forced many radicals to adopt liberal stances. They have been compronused by public education being forced to accept incompatable goals.

The purpose of this paper is to more fully understand this goal incompatability and to examine its effects upon a school. This first issue is probably best understood historically and the latter can be accomplished using ethnographic data from a Southern High School.

Education and Desegregation

Obviously, it is necessary to demonstrate that the goal in compatability of education (as embodied in American public schools) and desegregation. There are many ways to do this, but probably the succinct argument is based in history. Katz (1971), Kavier, Violas and Spring (1973) and Spring (1976) all demonstrate historically that public education in the United States was designed and functioned to serve the industrial and economic order, and not to promote equality since its goal was to maintain stratification while promoting industrial skills.

The Interaction of Stratification and Schooling in the United States

Katz (1971) has argued most convincingly that the "Great School Legend," as Greer (1972) calls it, does not seem to have much historical veracity. In fact, Katz portrays the origins of public education in the United States as part of a movement to maintain Protestantism over Catholicism as the dominant form of religion in this country. The force of this movement was bolstered by the demands of a Protestant controlled economy that was rapidly becoming industrial.

The industrialists saw the urban immigrant masses as a potential source of workers. However, most immigrants had come from agrarian backgrounds, and simply were lacking in skills that industry needed. Yet even more problematic than this lack of skills, since experience could easily give skills, was the potential of these masses for urban unrest, and more specifically an attitude that was not conducive to working in industry. The

necessary attitude, according to the industrialists, was one of acceptance and docility. Mass production required workers who not only had skills, but who also accepted their lot and were not divisive elements in a work setting that required acceptance of routine and authority. The Protestant industrialists, according to Katz, viewed public education as the appropriate vehicle through which to inculcate these skills and attitudes in the poor.

There was some dissention, however, over how to best provide these educational services. Katz documents the range of experimentation and discourse to highlight the significance of the final choice of "incipient bureaucracy" as the organizational form that was believed to be most able to achieve the desired goals.

Intriguingly, bureaucracy has been seen as the most "rational" form of organization (Weber 1964). This "rationality" was precisely what the industrialists saw. Bureaucracy maximizes order and control. It more regularizes the distribution of power and authority than do other forms of organization. Thus, when looking at the task of instilling a particular set of skills and values into an extensively heterogeneous mass of immigrant groups, the selection of bureaucracy by those in control was indeed "rational" for their interests. They were pushing integration into the industrial order, if not American society.

It could be argued then that the history of mass education in this country is a history of conflict over the meaning of integration. As Katz (1971) showed for the nineteenth century

origins of public schooling in this nation, Karier, Violas and Spring (1973) and Spring (1976) demonstrate for education in the twentieth century, the persistent logic of the public school movement has emphasized assimilation over intellectual development--with the often explicit goal of teaching "the norms necessary to adjust the young to the changing patterns of the economic system as well as to the society's more permanent values" (Karier, Violas and Spring 1973:7).

The assumption of bureaucracy as the organizational form for public education was, thus, an insidious design to forcibly, but subtly, assimilate the newly immigrated into an emerging industrial order that was dominated by Anglo-Saxon Protestants. Further, this "assimilative logic" has persisted and often seems to have been heightened by the increasing bureaucratization of public education.

It may be argued that, if anything, the "assimilative logic" may have been heightened over time through an institutional accrual of power. The assumption of bureaucracy as the organizational form for public education seems to have led to an insulation and isolation of the institution from those which it serves. Inasmuch as the preeminent feature of bureaucracy is internal control, problems that emerge within the organization are routinely resolved internal to the bureaucracy with only gross incidents referred to the formal linkage to the community, the school board. Further, given the pattern of democracy in this nation is simply majority rule, it is often the case that

the school board is more representative of local industrial interests than of the general community. Even when this is not the case, school board decisions are often based upon information and recommendations of the "experts" who staff the bureaucracy. Even the formation of state credentialling regulations reflect this pattern.

The institutional accrual of power by education seems to have been supported by the professionalization movement among educators. As with other occupations, professionalization appears to be a mechanism which "cools out" outside influence and control through the development of colleges of education that determine, under legislative mandate, who can be a teacher and who can be an "expert" in the field of education.

Interestingly, some of the characteristics of bureaucratization, differentiation and specialization in particular, have seemed to neutralize the possibility that anyone can be "expert" on all facets of the educational process. (Not only are educators specialists but schools have differentiated various curriculum blocks, administrative specialists, and levels of authority.) This trend seems to have been effective not only in reducing community influence and involvement, but also in thwarting the emergence of any large body of intellectuals who are "knowledgeable" across the gamut of educational philosophy, theory, policy, curriculum, instruction, and so on.

In short, public education, seemingly through increasing bureaucratization has over the past century accrued such power

that it may consciously only minimally represent even the industrialists. Yet the mold seems to have been cast in the 1830's, and education may never be able to escape its allegiance to the early industrialists, and its assimilative logic, if it never escapes bureaucracy as the dominant organizational form.

Desegregation is a challenge to the assimilative logic of public education because it serves the interests of those who have been denied a quality education because of their lack of assimilation. It represents a direct attack on public school because it puts the burden of proof, and therefore accountability, upon them for "integrating" those who have not been "assimilated." Further, given that bureaucracies by design maximize control, "integration" into the conventional world and the promise of economic sufficiency are the rewards for being assimilated and accepting the parameters of behavior and style promulgated by the institution. The threat or punishment used by public schools for promoting "assimilation" is the denial of access to conventional economic opportunity by denying access to educational certification. As a result then, desegregation when imposed as a goal for public schooling challenges the major social control mechanism of public schools. The goal of education as embraced in the American public schools is in direct contradiction with desegregation and equality of educational opportunity. The implementation of these incompatable goals would promise to have effects upon the everyday life of a public school.

Research Procedures

The data for this investigation were drawn from an ethnographic study of a desegregated high school with approximately 500 students in the South that was funded by the National Institute of Education. The study took place over two years, and was primarily geared to investigate the process of interracial schooling. The data were gathered via intensive, unstructured interviews, observations, and document review conducted primarily by the authors of this paper.

It is important to review the nature of ethnographic research, since it is a technique often misunderstood by non-anthropologists. Spicer (1976) argues that ethnographic research is emic, holistic, historical, and comparative in nature. That is, it gathers data directly from the people involved in the categories that are relevant to them (emic); it places events in context of the total experience under study (holistic); it incorporates history as a natural event in the studied experience (historical); and it considers and compares the variety of classes of events that make up that experience (comparative).

Further, the collection and analysis of ethnographic data is conducted under rigorous rules of analytic induction. The most significant of these rules for data analysis concerns data exhaustion. Simply put, a hypothesis that is inductively derived must explain all the data relative to the relationships and classes of events contained in the hypothesis. If the "heuristic" hypothesis does not meet this standard, then either it must be

modified so that all data are exhausted by it or a substitute hypothesis must be formulated that satisfies the standard. In short, an ethnographic analysis and/or synthesis is "true" for all relevant data collected, albeit it may not be generalizable across other settings. Further discussion of the ethnographic technique and a response to its critics can be found in Noblit (1977).

Finally, it should be noted that ethnographic data is best used to gain an interpretive understanding of an experience or event, and as such is vital to deriving a scientific proof concerning the nature of the experience or event. Both interpretive understanding and causal explanation (as derived from enumerative research strategies) are necessary to satisfy the notion of a scientific proof (Turner & Carr, 1976).

The School

Crossover High School (a pseudonym) was build in 1948, and graduated its first class in 1951. The structure was built on a 35-acre tract of land for the expanding residential areas of a Southern city. From the beginning, its program, Kindergarten through 12th grade, was established as a sort of college-prep school for the children of this economically affluent area of Memphis. In reflection of the political character of the community, the district boundaries were simply gerrymandered to exclude most children of working-class parents. And, of course, the dual system that existed under total racial segregation excluded the Black children from the neighborhood of Crossover located two blocks to the north, just across the tracks.

With this highly homogeneous school population, the academic program of Crossover High School (CHS) developed a reputation for excellence. Regularly, 95 percent of the senior graduating class enrolled in college. In one year during the 1950's, there were 11 Merit Scholar students in one graduating class. Many of the local influential middle-management executives, professional people, and political leaders are graduates of CHS. During the 1950s and 1960s, competition at the school was intense across the gamut of academics through the available social activities, and parents supported the school financially and spiritually.

The all-white faculty found the teaching situation highly attractive at Crossover. They received the best equipment and generous volunteer support. Only the select teachers were permitted to transfer to Crossover, and only the very best maintained a position. Hence, the teacher turnover up until 1969 was minimal.

In a 1972 desegregation plan, the Black neighborhood of Crossover, located just across some railroad tracks from CHS, was included in the school district. Not unlike other Black enclaves in residential areas of Southern cities, the community was established early in the century to a labor force for service in white homes and business. While the sense of community is strong in the neighborhood, it is plagued by property, violent, and victimless crimes. In many ways, it can be characterized as a "street corner society."

The former Black high school (now a feeder junior high school for CHS) was a source of pride for the neighborhood. Business and parent groups, as with the segregated CHS, were active supporters of the school.

Needless to say, both Black and white communities were apprehensive about pairing and desegregation of Feeder School and CHS, and responded with mixed emotions. When desegregation was ordered in 1972, most white parents with children in the senior high permitted them to remain and graduate. But many parents with students in the junior high, particularly girls, removed them to private schools rather than send them to what was considered an inferior Black junior high school. The Black community had no choice but to comply. The white principal at Crossover High School resigned rather than face the inevitable problems of desegregation. Thus, the Black principal at Feeder, with half his staff, moved to take charge of a desegregated Crossover High in September, 1972.

Results

The effects of goal incompatability upon school processes is best assessed when each school subsystem (Scrupski 1975) is analyzed separately. To that end, the results will be discussed in three parts: 1.) the administrative subsystem; 2.) the academic subsystem; and 3.) the student subsystem.

The Administrative Subsystem

The goal of desegregation represents a threat and a promise to school principals. If all goes well, they are revered as great leaders; if things do not go so well they are seen as incapable. By chance and the controversy of desegregation, we were witness to a natural experiment over the two years of the study in which one Black principal was replaced by another. The first Black principal embraced school desegregation as both a personal and organizational cause. Nevertheless, he recognized the potential threat, particularly since CHS was regarded by the media as the "barometer" of desegregation. Further, the threat was heightened by many of the white students being the children of well-to-do, elite families. It became apparent that if the goal of desegregation was to be achieved, these whites and the "old guard" teachers who had served them would somehow need to retain as students at CHS. As a result, the first Black principal allowed these white elites to have a disproportionate influence within the school since these "honor students", as we call them, came from families liberal enough to "try" desegregation, and were not above using their influence. Whenever possible, both whites and Blacks received "best dressed", "best student", etc. The selection of representatives for the student council was controlled by minimum grade and behavior requirement, teacher approval, and finally student elections--which ended up with whites being elected even as the school became majority Black. White students even received less discipline. As one teacher put it, "When I send a student--white--down to the office, the student is right back again."

As our observations began it was evident that optimism was fading fast. As the number of whites, and particularly the elite "honor students," declined, small enrollments in foreign language and advanced placement classes forced their elimination. The white, old guard teachers who had served these honor students also began to transfer to suburban schools.

It was in this context that the dual goals of education and desegregation came into conflict. Desegregation was threatening the academic program as the old guard teachers saw it. But then, a white social science teacher, a member of old guard, transferred and was replaced by a Black female who had administratively transferred about the system a number of times, and was regarded as incompetent by at least one of her previous superiors.

The honor students became almost immediately dissatisfied with her teaching. She assigned homework, required them to pay attention in class, and chided them for their laziness. While her competence may have been questionable, it appears that what disgruntled the students may well have been her "standards." Their performance on her examinations was poor; they rarely completed their homework, and she was unyielding to their demands. Nevertheless, she was lax in returning homework and examinations and was reluctant to take class time to go over basics and technical errors the students had made. She maintained they should already know such things in order to be in the advanced classes or at the very least should be able to sharpen such skills on their own.

It was this multiperspectival reality that forced a confrontation. Many of the honor students were angered and went directly to the principal to complain. The principal looked into the situation and decided to support the teacher. After continued complaints to the principal were met with support for the teacher, the majority of the honor students declared war. They went to the old guard whose allegiance seemingly required a sympathetic response. The old guard began to complain, but were reluctant to confront the principal even though they made it well known whose side they supported.

The honor students had previously not mobilized their parents for support. In fact, parents had all but ceased to exist as far as the school was concerned. The P.T.A. had not met yet that year. The Principal's Advisory Committee consisting of parents had been essentially recruited by the principal and rarely met. Parents to this point had been successfully "cooled out." The honor students had been so secure in their power that even though they might complain at home, they requested their parents to stay out. One mother related her daughter's responses to an offer of intervention: "Mother, I can handle it."

With their influence stunted, however, the honor students initiated the mobilization of their elite parents. The parents were concerned. They called the principal, came to the school, and talked with both the principal and the teacher. The teacher wavered but little in the face of the onslaught, and the principal stood firmly in support of her--after all, "standards" were at stake and the old guard had repeatedly demanded that standards

be maintained. Unfortunately, in retrospect, it appears that only their standards were to be immutable.

The elite parents were in a dilemma. Their liberal ideology supported desegregation even with some possible educational costs to their children, as they had originally viewed it, but were the costs now too high? They met and discussed the dilemma. With the support of their children, they decided that the teacher incident was an indication of the ineptness of the principal. They recounted the discipline problems, the principal's low key response to their complaints. They noted the erosion of the academic program with fewer and fewer accelerated classes being offered. They resolved that further action was dictated since seemingly there were two significant problems at the school, school security and the quality of education. Actually, the first issue was added to the bill of particulars late in the process of parents considering what basis upon which they should act and remained somewhat secondary throughout the year.

It seems that the development of these two issues was a major determinant of what further action, if any, was to be taken. Being influential people in the community, the parents were not going to take on the school just to resolve the incidents their children brought to them. The result of their search for the "basic issue" was that there were significantly quality of education problems at Crossover. Of course, this conclusion was largely based upon the reports of the honor students to their parents.

The parents went to the area superintendent with their complaints instead of to the principal. The parents interpreted his response as protecting the principal. The area superintendent explained the course offering problems and recited his faith in the principal and promised to look further into it. As a result of this action, the only P.T.A. meeting of the year was called. The meeting was hoped to result in once again "cooling out" the parents. The principal and the area superintendent both spoke about the problems, actions that had been taken, and the recalcitrance of some problems. The parents, Black and white, were generally not convinced, and began to vocalize their concerns and left still disgruntled.

The elite white parents decided to use their influence. They utilized their social networks and developed a direct "white line," as the principal was later to term it, to the central administration and the school board. In most instances, they began to by-pass the principal and the school, and went directly to the sympathetic ear of a school board member. Finally, however, the school board member convinced the parents that for their concerns to have a proper hearing, they would have to go through channels and appeal through the lines of authority within the bureaucracy.

In their working up the bureaucracy, a significant event occurred. At the school level, the principal and parents understood the problems in the same way. Nevertheless, the principal, while quite defensive, argued he was powerless to make the necessary changes. When the white elite parents got to the school

system's central administration, they were pressed to define precisely what they meant by "quality of education." Possibly through the design of the Administrator to "cool out" the parents, it ended up that the parents had defined the problems in a way that left them uneasy. It was resolved that the problem was defined as inadequate bureaucracy within the school. The parents were certainly ready to agree that the principal was a problem, if not the major problem, and the central office administrator argued that what was needed was a principal who could enforce the bureaucracy and thereby guarantee "quality" education.

The parents left the meeting with assurances that something would be done. Their impression was that the principal would be removed, probably by transfer to an elementary school.

Following the advice to work the bureaucracy, they went back to the area superintendent and then directly to the Superintendent of Schools. The parents left the latter meeting "feeling let down," according to one parent. Some of these parents began to reanalyze the problems at CHS. They indicated subsequently that at least some of the problems were "system" problems, and could be directed attributed to the Superintendent.

A malaise resulted from these encounters. The parents were still concerned but were uneasy as to how to act, and the mobilization began to wane. Even with the formation of a new PTA for the next year and some action by Blacks to keep the principal some began to interpret the battle as futile.

The reputation of the new Black principal preceeded him. He was known to be a "tough cookie" who ran a "tight ship." The coaches had heard through their network that he was a "student's principal." Other schools began to recruit the old guard teachers; they wanted to "skim off the cream." A few transfers resulted, and the new year began with apprehension.

Given the preceeding controversy, the new principal believed the problems at CHS were two-fold--discipline and quality of education. His strategy was to attack the former immediately and develop the latter. His discipline was strong, which the school participants had seemingly demanded in his mind.

He cleared the halls of students. He declared a guidance counselor surplus and then replaced her, even though the impropriety of this was noted by many of his staff. While the first principal had lacked dramatic community support, he at least was well connected in the Black networks both within the school system and in the Black neighborhood which Crossover served. The new Black principal, while having achieved great administrative success in the past, lacked the support of networks in and out of the school. He was not as much a part of the Black school system network, not part of the Black neighborhood network, lacked the immediate support of any teacher faction, and quickly lost the support of even the honor student network by eliminating their preferred status within the school. The e'ite white parents network, however, was full of praise even as some of their children transferred to other schools for a higher quality education and for access to student honors. In any case,

they argued these were not seen as problems due to the new principal, but to desegregation, the past principal, and the school system. He reassigned the coaches from study hall duty to large sections of social studies classes. He increased teaching leads even to the point of assigning each of the two guidance counselors to two classes each day in addition to their guidance responsibilities. He was very visible within the school and very coercive. He said he would eliminate anyone who was "not on the program," teacher or students, and did.

The school became uneasily quiet and closed. Students initially feared him, as did the faculty. No allegiances could be counted upon to insulate oneself from possible punishment. Faculty meetings were said to have become lectures in which questions were not to be raised or comments made. Student assemblies were patrolled by teachers as the principal chided the students for misbehavior and noise. His assembly dismissals were dotted with seemingly paternalistic praise for their cooperation. Control was the order of the day. If that was lacking in the past and the previous principal had "failed" because of it, the new principal was going to succeed by establishing order.

As the year progressed, the situation "normalized" somewhat. He received tacit support from most networks since their interests required at least some support from him. However, the halls once again were not clear of students during classes. Teachers put in for transfers and students transferred, withdrew or were pushed out. Some students became accustomed to his

procedures and developed friendly ties. One teacher even commented that "things were fine." But he also noted that he had been unaware of the problems attributed to former administration.

Each of these principals attempted to manage the dual goals of education and desegregation. The first Black principal became a victim of the incompatability of these goals. He learned that whites would support desegregation as long as there was no challenge to the academic status of their children. The second principal given his knowledge of what proceeded his transfer to CHS was quick to eliminate the elite status and disproportionate influence of the honor students. He learned that school status is more than just academic rank and grades. The honor students transferred when they lost control of student activities and honors. They sought "a social life" which CHS no longer provided them.

The Academic Subsystem

As we noted in the last section, desegregation did seem to challenge the academic program since as white, honor students left the school, the Black students did not replace them in the accelerated courses. The Black students were reluctant to face the "old guard" teachers and thereby place their grades in possible jeopardy: "Why should I work hard to get a 'C' in accelerated English when I can get an 'A' or 'B' in standard English? I keep up my grade point average." In short, CHS had with desegregation developed two curricula: one white and one black. Of course, part of this was due to school system policy. A memo to

secondary school principals explained it thereby:

> It is imperative that we have more uniformity in our academic program as we enter into our desegregation program in the fall of 1973. Many procedures which have been optional must now become standard policy.

The memo outlined the new, "standard" levels of instruction that included basic, standard, enriched and advanced placement, in order of increasing "ability" requirements.

The two curricula also had another logic. With desegregation, it seemingly was apparent that the Black students were less well prepared than their white counterparts to face CHS "prep school" curriculum. Therefore, the first year of desegregation led to a controversy about what to do with the Black students who would have graduated at the end of the year. In the end, "easy courses" were designed to allowed them to graduate without the "penalty of desegregation." However, it was at this point that the faculty were seen to have two divisions. One divisions, the old guard, was concerned with academic "standards" while the other, the Black teachers, showed more concern with "reaching the student." Given the experience of the first year of desegregation and this division, the old guard was assigned and assumed the "quality education" function; and the Black teachers assumed the "integration" function. This distinction is intriguing because the first Black principal, as we noted earlier, functionally saw desegregation as meaning keeping the white students. "Integration" required, on the other hand, bringing the Black students up to the ability levels of the whites. In some ways, desegregation was a burden to the Blacks: They did not receive the rewards of the school

in the proportion due them by elections but nevertheless they were to work harder to come "up" to the level of whites.

There were two other group of teachers that were members of neither the old guard or Black teachers networks. We ended up calling them the "Motley's"and the "coaches," respectively. The motleys taught their classes and were liked by the students. Nevertheless, they avoided the desegregation-education goal controversy. The coaches were immune to the controversies of the teachers, given their close affiliation with the principals. However, since most of them were Black they would support the Black teacher network if forced into a controversy.

While we would go into much more detail, the essential finding is evident. The goal incompatability contributed to a goal specialization among the staff. Of course, the school system seemingly demanded this by instituting levels of instruction that resegregated the students.

The Student Subsystem

As is evident from the preceding sections, the students were not inactive during all this. They developed four networks which we called the honor students, the freaks, the active Blacks, and the Red Oaks Blacks. The honor students were the children of white elite families. They took accelerated courses and had considerable influence within the school even though that waned with change of principals. The freaks were working class whites who would support the honor students when necessary. Usually however, they appeared alienated from and uncommitted to the school. They were the whites

who experienced desegregated classrooms. The active Blacks were highly committed students who were seeking access to the honor students' rewards and power within the school. They would opt for some advanced courses but would choose high grades over advanced coursework, and therefore took standard courses. However, as the number of accelerated courses dwindled because the active Blacks chose not to replace the white honor students who left CHS, they were able to modify the curriculum towards more heterogeneous groupings. The Red Oaks Blacks were essentially uncommitted Black students. They often attended school to be able to "hang out" with their friends. They put pressure on the Active Blacks to not be "integrated" by "eating cheese" or "acting like Tom." The Relative size of the networks, in decreasing order were the Red Oaks Blacks, the freaks, the honor students, and the Active Blacks.

Each network related to the dual goals in a unique way. The honor students argued they were for quality education and initially had been for desegregation. However, they argued that experience with desegregation had led them to become more racist. This type of statement usually was a reflection of the decreasing number of accelerated courses which threatened their future status, and after the change of principals it also accompanied discussions of their loss of control over student honors and activities and the undeserving now having such control.

The freaks experienced desegregation. The education goal never really did apply to them. CHS never had done much for them in the way of education and in some ways desegregation had heightened their relative statuses and power. For them, desegregation was

not much of a challenge or a threat. The major fear was interracial dating which was minimal, but nevertheless they were likely to characterize everything as "fine" even with desegregation.

The active Blacks were under a lot of pressure. They experienced desegregation alternatively with the freaks and the honor students, the Black teachers and the old guard. The honor students and the old guard were a major threat because they also controlled the possibility of quality education which was shared with a precious few of active blacks. The freaks and the active Black had the closest experience to true integration since they populated the same courses and activities. The Red Oaks Blacks were also a threat to the active Blacks because they could and did on occasion demand the active Blacks to choose between loyalty to their race and culture or their mobility aspirations.

The Red Oaks Blacks experienced a Black educational experience. Their teachers were predominately Black and so were their classmates. They also had little commitment to the school which, of course, was reciprocal. These students rarely were invited to be involved in school activities and often were received severe discipline.

Obviously, the good incapability had more effect upon the students than the students had an effect upon it given their low level of power in the school. However, that is not to say they were without power and influence. As we discussed in the administrative subsystem section, the students could mobilize support, albeit some could mobilize more than others. Nevertheless, the dual goals and their incompatibility at Crossover High School School led to a resegregated educational experience.

Conclusions

This case study has discussed the effects in one high school of the imposition of the desegregation goal. Seemingly, its incompatibility with the logic of public education in our country (i.e. regeneration of stratification rather than mobility) led to a number of problems at CHS. It led to transfer of the first Black principal, to the division of the faculty, and resegregated educational and cultural experience of the students.

Let us return, however, to the plight of those whose analysis of public education in the United States has been altered by the school desegregation process. If you remember the conservatives have become somewhat fatalistic and the more radical have found themselves often supporting public schooling because desegregation has challenged the logic of that institution. Our data do little to quell the fatalism, and in fact this study has been lightheartedly tagged by N.I.E. as a "high gloom" study. Similarly, it does little for those who are defending desegregated public education--"high gloom" again.

Nevertheless, we think this study is instructive because it demonstrates the perservance of the historical logic of public education as Katz (1971) noted. Even with the desegregation challenge to this logic, Crossover High School continued to stratify its students and resegregated. It continued to promote docility and identified students who would be socially acceptable to industrial and commercial employers.

It may be that desegregation as a goal is simply not up to the challenge. Nevertheless, equal educational opportunity is constitutionally required and will, and probably should, continue. However, it may well behoove us to look more critiquely at the goal called quality education that we once thought about and once again attempt to redefine it. Nevertheless, we doubt that even this will be effective unless we are able to modify the linkages of schools and schooling to a stratified, segmented economy.

References

Karier, C., P. Violas and J. Spring
1973 Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Katz, M. B.
1975 Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger.

Noblit, G. W.
1977 Ethnographic Approaches to Evaluation. Paper presented at the National Conference on Criminal Justice Evaluation, Washington, D.C., February.

Scrubski, A.
1975 The Social System of the School," in Sccial Forces and Schooling, N. Shimahara and A. Scrupski, (eds.) New York: David Mckay

Spring, J.
1976 The Sorting Machine. New York: David Mckay

Turner, S., and D. Carr
1976 The Process of Criticism in Interpretive Sociology and History." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, New York, N.Y.

Weber, M.
1964 Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press